

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

GEORGE JEFFERSON,	Case No. 3:16-cv-00059-MMD-VPC
Plaintiff,	ORDER
v.	
INGHAM, <i>et al.</i> ,	
Defendants.	

This action is a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by a former state prisoner. On October 31, 2017, this Court issued an order directing Plaintiff to file his updated address with this Court on or before November 15, 2017. (ECF No. 17.) The deadline has now expired, and Plaintiff has not filed his updated address or otherwise responded to the Court’s order.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833

1 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson*  
2 *v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and  
3 failure to comply with local rules).

4 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey  
5 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors:  
6 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to  
7 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring  
8 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.  
9 *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130;  
10 *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

11 In the instant case, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in  
12 expeditiously resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket,  
13 weigh in favor of dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs  
14 in favor of dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of  
15 unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See  
16 *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor — public policy  
17 favoring disposition of cases on their merits — is greatly outweighed by the factors in  
18 favor of dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to  
19 obey the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"  
20 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d  
21 at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file his updated address with the Court on  
22 or before November 15, 2017 expressly stated: "Plaintiff shall have until Wednesday,  
23 November 15, 2017 to file a notice of change of address or this court will recommend that  
24 this action be dismissed." (ECF No. 17.) Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that  
25 dismissal would result from his noncompliance with the Court's order to file his updated  
26 address by November 15, 2017.


27 ///

28 ///

1 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed with prejudice based on  
2 Plaintiff's failure to file an updated address in compliance with this Court's October 31,  
3 2017, order.

4 It is further ordered that the Clerk of Court enter judgment accordingly.

5  
6 DATED THIS 29<sup>th</sup> day of November 2017.

7   
8 \_\_\_\_\_  
9 MIRANDA M. DU  
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28